

7016
REASONS OF EXCEPTION

TO THE

Circulation of Romish Versions

BY THE

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

BY

REV. A. SUTHERLAND, SCOTSBURN,

AND

REV. JOHN MURDO, WALLACE.

"He that hath my Word, let him speak my Word faithfully," &c.—Jas. xlii. 22.

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED AT BARNES' STEAM PRESS,

Corner of Sackville and Granville Streets.

1863.

NS

220.5

S

Circulation

WHEN
Creator,
salvation
Testam
and cal
The in
New in
Beza, I
irrefra
"Heav
style,
glory
salvat
our co
that
Old a
in th
tures
and
rule
orac
stan
A
tho
the
the
siv
Bl
DI
G
D
G

1962

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20540

1962-1963

REASONS OF EXCEPTION

TO THE

Circulation of Romish Versions by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

WHEN man, by the fall, lost the knowledge and enjoyment of his Creator, God, of his infinite mercy, made himself and the way of salvation known, in the inspired Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; in a form both suited to man's capacities and necessities, and calculated to be permanent. 2 Tim. iii. 16. 17; 2 Pet. i. 21. The inspired penmen wrote the Old Testament in Hebrew, and the New in Greek. And by the indefatigable and life-labours of Erasmus, Beza, Usher, Mill, Welstein, Bengel, Greuback, &c., we have the most irrefragable *external evidence to satisfy our reason*; while by the "Heavenliness of the matter, efficacy of the doctrine, majesty of the style, consent of all the parts, scope of the whole, (which is to give all glory to God,) and the full discovery it makes of the way of man's salvation," we have the most convincing *internal evidence to satisfy our conscience* that these Scriptures are indeed the Word of God,—that God is the author of every statement contained in the Hebrew Old and Greek New Testament; and that every statement contained in them is worthy of having God for its author. The inspired Scriptures are, therefore, the standards of appeal in every point of doctrine, and in every case of controversy,—the matter of our faith, and the rule of our practice. How infinite the mercy by which the *living oracles* have been preserved in their purity and integrity, notwithstanding human infirmity and malignity!

All Protestant versions are translations of these originals; and though on the one hand, *no translation can equal the original*, nor on the other do these versions render the original with equal force; yet they contain the subject-matter inspired so fully, correctly, and exclusively, that though written in uninspired language, they are inspired Bibles. The principal Protestant versions are Luther's in German, Diodati's in Italian, Martin's and Ostervald's in French, the States General in Dutch, Casper Baroli's in Hungarian, Valera's in Spanish, D'Almeida's in Portuguese, and our own authorized English and Gaelic versions. Of these the English, Dutch, Portuguese, and Gaelic are as perfect as translations can well be. They contain nothing contrary to, or inconsistent with, the particular passage, the context, and analogy of the whole truth.

These Scriptures the Holy Spirit owns as his own truth, by opening and applying them savingly. It would be contrary to all our ideas of the blessed God, that he would own and bless as his truth, anything but what is his truth. It would be contradictory of his very nature and character; and destroy all our confidence in the word of God, as the only and sure foundation of our comfort and hope. The Spirit's work on men's hearts, is, by opening their understanding, to lead them into all truth. There he makes himself known, and makes himself over to his people, and engages to perform all covenant promises to them. There they take hold of him accordingly. They, therefore, believe all he has declared as truth, hold all he has appointed as ordinances, and engage to the performance of all he has required as duty. And no consideration of names, numbers, or consequences, can induce them to receive as binding on the conscience, or to be owned as doctrine, and practised in religion, anything not clearly expressed in, or fairly deducible from, the Word of God. He has magnified his own word *above all his works*; and they esteem it *above their lives*. They know who has said, "*The Scriptures must be fulfilled.*" It is in the "comfort of the Scriptures" they live and die. What millions have laid down their lives rather than renounce, corrupt, or abuse the Word of God, or any part of it? Was ever a believer known to burn the Bible even to save his life? It takes a priest of Rome to burn the Word of God. It is an act directed against God himself, of which no believer can be guilty unless fearfully left to himself at the time.

The Word of God is the greatest treasure, and the greatest trust, ever committed to the keeping of mere creatures. And we are laid under the most solemn obligation to improve, preserve, and extend it throughout the world; enforce by encouragements and warnings, which none can disregard but such as practically say, "There is no God." How fully do our subordinate standards recognize this obligation. None is ordained to office until he has distinctly and solemnly declared his belief in, and acceptance of, these Scriptures as the Word of God; and the Confession of Faith, as the *confession of his own faith*; renounced all that is contrary to, or inconsistent with the same; and engaged to conform thereto and defend it, *at whatever cost*. No person is admitted to sealing ordinances until he has openly owned and accepted the confession, and engaged to conform to it himself, and bring up his household in its doctrine, worship, and government. Here our Church speaks and acts clearly, decidedly, and authoritatively. And, if it is a matter of infinite importance, and divine obligation, to have and hold, pure and entire, the Word of God, with all that he has therein declared and appointed; this decision and action of the Church has the sanction of God himself,—she is right. But, if otherwise, the duty is not so definite, and the obligation divine and stringent,—then she is wrong. If she can countenance her ministers or members circulating, or defending the circulation, under the name of "Holy Scriptures," "Word of God," "The Truth," Bibles containing the Apocrypha, the work of uninspired men; the

Popish versions, containing the leading doctrines of Antichrist; or the Unitarian Bible, culled of all that makes the Bible tidings of salvation to lost sinners,—then she has no right to impose the vows, or require the profession referred to, without limitations which would virtually nullify them.

Let the reader carefully examine the "Confession of Faith," and he will see to what every office-bearer, by his vows of ordination, and every member, by his solemn profession, stands pledged, and what tremendous responsibility rests upon them. Is not every person, of whatever position, bound to be faithful? *Who* will be faithful, if not the office-bearers and members of the *household of faith*? And *wherein* will they be faithful, if not as stewards of the mysteries of God? Is not circulating the Scriptures, as certainly as expounding their contents, part of that stewardship? How can discipline be exercised with regard to sermons containing doctrines inconsistent with the Word of God, if the circulation of Bibles, containing doctrines contrary to the whole tenor of that Word, is to be countenanced, and still more defended. How can our Church courts refuse baptism to parents, against whose whole christian character nothing can be adduced, but the simple fact that they have not partaken of the Lord's supper, though it may have arisen from real sense of unmeetness and want of light, doubts and fears pressing upon their minds? or refuse communion to those who traffic in intoxicating liquors,—and yet approve of the circulation of Popish error? The fact of these errors being mixed up with the truth, in no degree alters their character, or our duty respecting them. We must be consistent.

Under these convictions, and with certain facts within our knowledge, to exonerate ourselves, and prevent our Church being compromised, or restriction being laid upon the liberty and liberality of her people, we did deem it our duty to bring out a few things bearing upon this subject; and did so in a way calculated to give just ground of offence to no person or party. We did so through the proper channel—*The Record*—through which the immediate occasion was given, and the only recognized organ of our Church. *The Record*, instead of upholding the interests of "the truth," opened its pages to what it represented and called a "useless controversy." We had no controversy with any party. We objected to certain errors being printed and circulated by the Bible Society, incorporated with the Truth, under the name of *Holy Scriptures*. The errors are indisputable.

Passing from this, however, further investigation has brought an amount of information to our knowledge, of which we had no idea at first. And we deem it our duty to enter into the subject more fully, and leave the christian public to decide, whether we are actuated by improper motives, without a just ground, or are discharging an imperative duty, imposed alike by the standards of our Church and the endangered interests of protestantism in our day. In doing so, we distinctly disavow the idea of being in "antagonism" to the British and Foreign Bible Society. We are thoroughly satisfied with the

fundamental article of their basis; and the Lord wonderfully blesses a large amount of their work. But, we are most strongly opposed to their circulating a large amount of undisguised popery, in actual violation of that very fundamental article, and in disregard of light and remonstrance. Though almost incredible, it is a fact, that the London committee, from within five years of the origination of the Society, have been to this day violating that article, and struggling in defence of these violations, against the earnest and constant contendings of the most devoted christians of the day. Having once taken a wrong step, they never yielded, but what they could hold no longer.

In no part of the world has the Word of God taken deeper root in men's hearts, or brought forth richer fruit in their lives, than in Britain. Besides what Britain owes to that Word as a nation in stability, prosperity, and influence, there, generation has succeeded generation from the Reformation till now, of the most profoundly pious, and extensively learned. In what country of like extent, in the whole world, do we see so much piety, talent, learning, wealth and effort concentrated upon any one object, as are there united and employed for the diffusion and defence, as well as exposition, of the genuine Word of God. The best evidence of this is afforded by the annual meetings and reports of the various ecclesiastical bodies and religious societies, with their different spheres of labour, departments of work, and ever-increasing success and prospects. If Germany has been called the "cradle of the Reformation," Britain may well be called the centre of the world's evangelization.

Next to the Church, which is a divinely constituted organization, Bible Societies occupy a position least liable to objection, and most likely to accomplish their grand design. As Rev. Dr. McGregor, of Pictou, well puts it, "What real occasion does the *circulation of the pure Word of God*, which is the sole business of Bible Societies, afford for difference of opinion."—Life, p. 387.

The British and Foreign Bible Society stands on pre-eminently the vantage ground—first in the field—springing up among a people foremost in the world for true zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls—with an object perfectly unsectarian, and which cannot fail to touch the Christian heart—with a fundamental law calculated to unite the efforts and draw upon the benevolence of all who love the Lord and the souls of their fellow-men. That law, prefixed to every annual report, says, "The sole object shall be to encourage the wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment"; and "The only copies, in the languages of the United Kingdom, to be circulated by the Society shall be the authorized version."

Here two things appear to be settled. *First*, That by "Holy Scriptures," is meant, in the language of Dr. McGregor, "The pure word of God:," or the inspired originals, and faithful translations of the same. And, *Secondly*, a clear distinction is drawn between the authorized version and other versions in the languages of the United Kingdom, particularly the Popish version, the Unitarian Bible, and

Bibles including the Apocrypha. A distinction evidently founded upon regard to purity; and, upon that ground, excluding all but the *authorized* version from the operations of the Society. And herein, the Society gives, really, a pledge that the same principle shall be carried out as far as their operations may extend. The committee *now* tell us that they do not act as a "Board of Biblical critics," to decide upon the merits of versions. But this very distinction recognizes the settled results of Biblical criticism, and the Society is pledged to abide thereby in all their operations. For a few years things went on smoothly and in keeping with this principle. Had the committee continued so, their strength and the results of their labours would have been this day immensely beyond what they are. No other Bible Society would have been heard of in Britain. All the others would have been affiliated branches; and all their resources flow into one treasury. All the friends of the Bible would have been united in one firm phalanx. A reverence for, and unanimity about, the Word of God, would have been exhibited to all the world, which, by the blessing of God, could not fail to secure a success to their labours and a reception for the Bible, which cannot be expected so long as the inconsistency is practised of sending forth a pure and a corrupt Bible side by side. All the dissatisfaction felt, and all the opposition ever offered to the Society, originated in the committee's infringement of their own well understood fundamental law. There have been altogether three great infringements and three corresponding struggles, two of which have been successful, and the third is tending toward success. Now, we assert, that no Bible Society in the world had stronger inducements to persevere upon the course upon which it started originally, circulating nothing but the "pure Word of God." No Bible Society ever *lost* more upon adopting a different course.

The committee considered a resolution passed and put upon their minutes a sufficient warrant to adopt for printing and circulating versions, the circulation of which was, in or out of the kingdom, a direct violation of the constitution of the Society. At an early period they began to circulate Bibles with the Apocrypha, declared by the "Confession of Faith" of the Presbyterian Church, to be "No part of the inspired Word of God."* A keen, long-continued, and finally successful struggle, on the part of such as felt the obligation of conscientiously adhering to principle, was the result. Harmony was broken up. But with whom lay the blame? The committee pursued their course and defended it by arguments of expediency. On the other side were the plain injunctions, directions, and warnings of the Word of God. The great body of the Society's supporters from Scotland withdrew and formed Societies of their own upon the same principle, but more definitely expressed, as early as 1809. The struggle, however, was continued, and Scottish christians took a deep interest in it, until in 1826-7 the committee were forced to adopt

* The articles of the Church of England deny them to be "Holy Scriptures."

resolutions excluding the Apocrypha from their operations, and interposing between them and any connexion with its circulation by others. Another infringement still more glaring was, in deference to the presence of Unitarian members, not opening or closing meetings of committee with prayer; thus really ignoring christianity altogether. This, of course, gave rise to an earnest struggle. And in 1831, partly on this ground, and partly on ground of the vote of the committee on Romish versions, a large number withdrew and formed the Trinitarian Bible Society, on the basis of a recognized christianity. The struggle, however, was carried on until some few years ago the committee altered their course here also. The ground of each of these struggles was the cause of heavy drawbacks in regard to supporters, pecuniary resources, and circulation.

But a third, and equally important struggle, has arisen, and still continues, on account of the publication and circulation of the Romish versions. To understand this aright, we must keep in view three very distinct books, viz.: the inspired original Scriptures, the Latin Vulgate, and the modern Romish versions. The Church of Rome has never recognized the Hebrew and Greek as the inspired Word of God. She recognizes the Vulgate (itself a translation, and very corrupt,) as the authentic Scriptures, and passed a decree anathematizing all who did not acknowledge the Vulgate to be the sacred Scriptures, or received anything else as inspired. The genuine Word of God was thus rejected; and from A.D. 1546, when the Vulgate was first declared to be the authentic Scriptures, edition after edition was declared authentic, and condemned in its turn, for its many and grave errors, until 1592, when the one in general use ever since, with 2000 important corrections on the immediately preceding one, was declared authentic. Ah, poor Church of Rome! a sinful worm can make and unmake her Bible!

To enumerate the errors of this authentic Vulgate, as compared with the inspired originals, would be out of the question here; but they may be classed as follows.—It (1) contains many of the errors of Popery, (2) perverts the meaning of many passages of Scripture, (3) makes large additions to the sacred text, (4) and omits even whole passages of the inspired Word. Modern Romish versions profess to be translations of the Vulgate, but strictly speaking, they are not so. They all, and some more than others, falsify the text of the Vulgate to suit the genius of modern Popery. Though the translator takes the Vulgate for the *basis* of his work, yet, he has his eye upon the system, and the people for whom his version is intended. Accordingly, these translations vastly differ from each other. They vary from the Vulgate, as a standard, in the following order: (1) the English, Douay; (2) Italian, Martini; (3) French, DeSaci; (4) the Spanish, Scio, and Portuguese, Pereira,—the British and Foreign Bible Society circulate these, except the Douay. It may be also stated that the Roman Catholic Drs. of Cologne, in their edition of DeSaci of 1739, expunged a gross addition DeSaci makes to the

Vulgate, (Philemon 22.) but the British and Foreign Bible Society retain it to this day.

These versions so completely embody the doctrines and practices of Popery, that Pope after Pope has recommended them as the antidote to the Protestant, or faithful versions of the originals. To be christian, even in name, the Church of Rome must own some Bible; yet such a Bible only as contains the elements of her system. At the same time, while she is Papal she never will, she cannot, sanction the right of the people to peruse the book she recognizes as the Bible. No one dare possess it, under pain of eternal damnation, without a *written license from his superior*—a license never granted to the common people, nor to any person likely to exercise his own judgment upon the contents of the book. This is expressly laid down in Rule IV. of the index expurgatorius.

Notwithstanding this, however, the London committee, as far back as 1813, entered into a hopeless correspondence with the British priesthood, to obtain their consent to the printing and gratuitous circulation, by the Society, of an edition of the Douay Bible, being the very best of the Romish versions. When all was in readiness to issue the edition, the Rev. Peter Gondolphy, on behalf of the priesthood, replied as follows: "The Catholic clergy *will not relax a single principle* which has been in exercise to this time,—would not put the English Scriptures into the hands of the poor and ignorant,—nor give a Bible, *even with notes*, into the hands of every one who might wish for it, but at the will, and under the direction of their superiors.—Prot. vol. I. 259; Elliotte on Romanism, vol. I. 94. This will shew the value of the authority that said and repeated, "The British and Foreign Bible Society steadily refused to circulate the Douay Bible."

From the year 1804 onward, Bible Societies were formed on the Continent; and soon thereafter the British and Foreign Bible Society extended their operations to the Continent also, but they did not adopt the Romish versions for some years. In the year 1816, the Primate of Poland applied to the reigning Pope, Pius VII, who replies: "Venerable Brother—You have appealed to the **Holy See**, respecting what are called Bible Societies, and enquired what **you** ought to do. It is necessary to adhere to the salutary decree, (Rule IV. of index,) that no versions of the Bible be permitted in the Vulgar tongue, but such as are approved by the Apostolic See." The following, from Pius VI. to Martini, Archbishop of Florence, is still more explicit. It is prefixed to the Douay Bible. He says: "Beloved Son—When vast numbers of bad books, which attack religion, are circulated, you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors so widely disseminated. This you have seasonably effected by publishing the sacred Scriptures, especially when you have added explanatory notes. Thus you have not swerved from the laws of the congregation of the index, or the constitution of Benedict XIV., our immortal predecessor." The reader cannot fail to

observe, that the danger to "morals and doctrine," is from the circulation of the Protestant Bible; and that the "purity of morals and doctrine," that is, genuine "Popish doctrines and practices," is to be drawn from the Popish versions of the Vulgate.

A recommendation of DeSaci by the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris for his own diocese and others of minor authority, are prefixed to the edition published at Brussels by the British and Foreign Bible Society, now before us. What are we to make of this? Does the Cardinal Archbishop recommend the free distribution and perusal of even DeSaci throughout his diocese? Never. The rule of the index is strictly adhered to. It just signifies that this is one of the versions recognized by the Church, and contains enough of the doctrines and practices of Popery to *eradicate* the "heretical pravity" of the "bad books," the worst of which is the Protestant Bible. Is that noble Society, acting under the Cardinal's banner, doing in France and other countries just what Popes directed and recommended to be done in Poland and Italy, to destroy the effect of Bible circulation? But to what purpose is this recommendation by the Society? The Roman Catholic knows full well that he dare not possess or read *any* Bible without the written license of his superior, unless he does so *unknown* to, or in *open defiance* of his Church. In either case the recommendation is of no value to him, and he prefers the purest version of the Word of God. None but credulous Protestants, who know nothing of Popery, could be misled by the decoy. How the colporteurs act on the field we cannot say; but the following table will shew how the Society act in the supply and price of Protestant and Romish versions, as may be seen from their report of 1867:—

	Protestant		Romish	
	Bible.	Testament.	Bible.	Testament.
Italy.....	1 = 1s. 4d.	1 = 7d.	1	1 = 6d.
France.....	2 = 2s. 6d. & 6s.	1 = 7d.	1 = 3s. 3d.	
Portugal.....		1 = 1s.	1 = 3s.	1 = 7d.
Spain.....	1 = 5s.	1 = 7d.	1 = 3s.	1 = 7d.
Holland.....	1 = 1s. 6d.	1		1
Germany.....	1 = 1s. 6d.		1	2 = 8s. & 10s.
	6	5	5	6

From this it will be seen that in these six languages there are as many of the corrupt as there are of the faithful versions on sale by the Society, with a very great advantage in favour of the Romish. For example, Martin's Bible costs 6s., while DeSaci costs only 3s. 3d. In Portugal, though the entire Protestant Bible is printed, it is not sold; the Testament costs 1s., while the Romish costs only 7d. In Spain the Protestant Bible costs 5s., the other only 3s. In Germany there is no Protestant Testament printed by the Society, while two Romish versions of the New Testament are printed and circulated. These facts are undeniable and indefensible. They speak for themselves, and require no comment.

But let us now consider the character of these versions,—the light

thrown upon the whole subject,—the attitude of the committee in respect to it, and the elements of which the committee itself is composed, in their united bearing upon our path of duty.

1. The character of these versions. Our proposed limits will not allow of being very minute in pointing out the difference between the different Romish versions. Neither shall we quote in the languages of these versions, which would only be a dead letter to the great body whom we address. Such as know the languages, can consult the passages referred to for themselves.

First—Redemption mediately ascribed to the Virgin Mary, and divine honour consequently paid her.

Gen. iii. 15—"She shall bruise thy head and taen shalt try to bite her heel" DeSaci, Vulgate and Douay nearly the same.

The Hebrew, the Greek version, and the Vulgate of Jerome, all read "*He*," namely, the promised *seed*. DeSaci confesses that his rendering is *not* according to the Hebrew. The modern Vulgate, and all the Romish versions, contrary to the inspired text, render it "*She*," viz., the woman, or virgin. To evade the charge of ascribing redemption to the Virgin instead of the Saviour, they say, "She does it by her Son." But it is one thing to take his human body of the substance of the Virgin, and quite another thing by the sacrifice of himself, to bruise the head of the serpent and forever perfect all them that are sanctified, to which Mary is as much indebted for the salvation of her own soul as any other saved sinner. Heb. ii. 9, 14; Rom. xvi. 20. Upon this is founded the great power of the Virgin in heaven to command her Son, and procure favour for her worshippers, whence she is called "The only refuge of sinners;" "Queen of heaven;" and, as "Bathsheba sat on the right hand of Solomon, and Solomon bowed to his mother, so Mary at the right hand of Jesus, and Jesus bows to his mother." Hence the blasphemous devotion of modern Popery to her worship.

Luke i. 28—"Hail, O full of grace, the Lord is with you; you are blessed among *all* women."—DeSaci. Here (1) A character is given to the Virgin, given exclusively to the Son of God. John i. 14. And (2) "*All*" is an addition by the translator. It is not found in the Vulgate, or Douay. It is designed to exalt the Virgin above other saints. On this passage are founded, "The hail Mary," "The Litany of the Virgin," and some hymns, as blasphemous as ever creatures invented.

Second—The worship of creatures and created things, images, angels, relics.

Exod. xx. 5—"You shall not adore them, (images) nor render them *supreme* worship."—DeSaci.

"Supreme" is not in the Vulgate or Douay. God is the only object of worship; and the genuine Scriptures acknowledge only one kind of worship, and that is due to God only. Matt. iv. 10. But the Church of Rome divides worship between God and creatures, and makes three

degrees of worship. *Latria*, or supreme worship to God only; *Hyperdulia*, or middle, to the Virgin; and *Dulia*, or the lowest worship to saints, angels, images of the saints and relics. The Vulgate and Douay therefore expressly prohibit the worship of images in this text and Deut. v. 9. But DeSaci, introducing into the text *supreme*, introduces the Romish doctrine of different kinds of worship, which clearly implies, that, while the "supreme" worship, due to God only, is not to be given to images, the worship proper to themselves *may* and *ought* to be given them.

Col. ii. 18—"Let no one take from you the prize of your career, affecting to appear humble by a *superstitious* worship of angels.—DeSaci. The Vulgate and Douay have no word corresponding to *superstitious*, and so expressly forbid *any* worship of angels. DeSaci, by the addition of that qualifying word, clearly implies that the proper worship of angels may be given them. Ps. xcix. 5, "Exalt ye the Lord our God, and adore his footstool, for it is holy."—DeSaci. (xcix. 5). The Vulgate and Douay the same. Nothing can be plainer than this if there is such a thing as idolatry. Heb. xi. 21, "By faith Jacob dying blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top his staff," Vulgate and Douay. But DeSaci reads, "By faith Jacob bowed himself low before the rod of authority which his son was carrying." The other reading is bad enough, but what is the original of this. The passage referred to is Gen. xlvii. 31, and correctly translated, "Israel adored God turning to his bed's head," by the Vulgate and Douay. In Heb. xi. 21, they falsify their own translation of Gen. xlvii. 31. But what the Douay has in the note on Heb. xi. 21, DeSaci introduces into the text. And more glaring still, in a pamphlet entitled, "The Bible Society and its versions, by a member of the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society," the following language is used, "If it be merely understood that Jacob worshipped God leaning upon the top of his staff, *then we are at a loss to discover any act of faith at all suitable to the apostle's argument.* DeSaci has well brought out the meaning of the passage when he reads, *that Jacob bowed himself low before the staff of authority which his son bore.*"

This language, never disavowed by the committee, is justly assumed to have their sanction. And let the reader ponder, how it charges the inspired text with defect, and commends the apocryphal addition of DeSaci, with the unblushing idolatry it is intended to support. Is it possible that this pamphlet can be the work of a Protestant? Can the committee have any regard to the second commandment?

Third—The merit of faith, prayer, good works, and alms.

1 Peter i. 9—"Obtaining the salvation of your souls as the end, *and prize*, of your faith."—DeSaci. *And prize* is unknown to the Vulgate and Douay. DeSaci adds both to the text and doctrine of the Vulgate. "Prize" is a reward of merit. Their faith, therefore, to some extent at least, merits their salvation. Philemon 22—"For

I hope that God will restore me to you yet once more, by the merit of your prayers."—DeSaci.

The Vulgate, Douay, and *DeSaci* by the Paris Bible Society, read as in our authorized version, "Through your prayers." The words, "Yet once more by the merit of," are so glaring, that the Romish editors of Cologne left them out of their edition of 1759. They are only found in the Brussels edition by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

Heb. xiii. 16—"Be mindful to exercise love and to share your goods; for it is by the like sacrifices that one renders God favourable."—DeSaci. This is more intensely Popish than either the Vulgate or Douay. According to this, the sole procuring cause of divine favour is "exercising love and sharing the goods."

Rev. viii. 3, 4.—"And there was given him much perfume *composed* of the prayers of all the saints that he should offer it," &c. And the smoke of the perfume *composed* of the prayers of the saints ascended," &c.—DeSaci. "Composed" is an addition by DeSaci to the text of the Vulgate and Douay.

The "incense" is the merit of the atonement of the Lord Jesus, the virtues and efficacy of which, presented by our great High Priest, makes the persons and services of God's people acceptable; and without which, "our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." But DeSaci ignores the merit of the atonement. According to the original, the incense is to be offered *with* the prayers. The incense and the prayers are different things. According to the Vulgate, and its versions, the *incense* is the prayers. The prayers of all saints are *incense*, and a *perfume* before God. Hence, in the prayers and other merits of the saints, there is an inexhaustible treasure in the Church, always available for the necessities of the faithful.

Fourth—Marriage a sacrament.

Eph. v. 32—"This is a great sacrament say I, in Jesus Christ and in the Church."—DeSaci. The word rendered *sacrament* occurs twenty-seven times in the Greek New Testament. It signifies *mystery*, and is so rendered in the Douay, except in one other instance. In the Vulgate it is rendered *mystery* in twenty, and *sacrament* in the other seven places, viz., Eph. i. 9; iii. 3, 9; v. 32; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Prov. i. 20; xvii. 7. None of the Romish versions faithfully translate this word as in the Vulgate. And, either the Vulgate does not attach the same meaning to the term, or else sacraments are very numerous, and very strange in the Church of Rome. The incarnation, the seven Churches of Asia, and the Roman harlot herself, are all sacraments, as well as marriage; and to be faithful translations of the Vulgate, the versions should so render the seven texts.

Fifth—Virginity and celibacy exalted above marriage, sacrament though it be.

Matt. i. 25—"And knew her not *when* she brought forth her first-born son."—DeSaci. The Vulgate and Douay read as in our version,

"*till*." These, in keeping with the Greek, simply state that up to that time she was a virgin, without any reference to the future. The Church of Rome has her nunneries, and imposes vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience; and enforces perpetual virginity by the most powerful of examples—"when" Mary brought forth her first-born she remained a virgin ever after.

1 Cor. vii. 35—"Now, this I say—to bring you to that which is more holy."—DeSaci. V. 34—"But he who—firmly believes in his heart, and thinks that he ought to keep his daughter a virgin, *does a good work*."—DeSaci.

The Vulgate and Douay read, nearly in language and entirely in meaning, as our authorized version. There are no words in them corresponding with the following,—“To bring you to—more holy—good work.” DeSaci makes marriage *holy*, (which is nowhere said in Scripture,) but perpetual virginity *more holy* than marriage, a sacrament! He represents the apostle as endeavouring to bring christians up to this higher degree of holiness; and the parent who induces his daughter to give up her property and personal liberty, take the veil and enter a convent, as doing a work that, partly at least, merits his own salvation. Let the reader, just for a moment, think of so corrupting the Scriptures as to represent the apostle Paul *commending* and *urging* the principle of Popish nunneries! 1 Tim. iii. 2, “A bishop then must be blameless, *he must have married* only one wife”—DeSaci. The Vulgate and Douay read as our authorized version—“He is to be blameless, and the husband of one wife.” His being a husband is no hindrance, but rather a qualification. There is no change of tense in the second clause in the original or Vulgate. But no priest is to have a wife. If he has been married, he must put his wife away before he can enter the priesthood. Though God has said, “They whom God hath joined let not man put asunder.” And, “The woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband *as long as he liveth*.” Popery teaches that a man who *may have married* a wife may put her away and enter the priesthood. It is in the Bible itself, according to DeSaci!

Sixth—The doctrine of indulgences. 2 Cor. ii. 10, “That which you grant to any one by indulgence, I grant also, for if I use indulgence I use it for your sakes in the name and person of Christ”—DeSaci.

Neither the Vulgate nor Douay have the word, or convey the idea of indulgence. But DeSaci represents the apostle, as by the authority of Christ, granting indulgences, and sanctioning the practice of the same by the Church.

Seventh—The doctrine of purgatory. 1 Pet. iii. 19, “By which he went to preach to the spirits which *were* in prison”—DeSaci. The Vulgate and Douay the same. According to the original, Noah, by the spirit of Christ, preached to the wicked generation of his day, and while the ark was in course of building. But being swept away in

their wickedness by the flood, they are kept in prison awaiting the judgment of the great day. According to the Romish versions Christ went personally, between his crucifixion and resurrection, to the middle state, purgatory, and preached to those *who were* kept till *then* in prison, but who *then were translated to a better state*; shewing that there is a state in which souls suffer, and where they may receive benefit from others toward final deliverance.

Eighth—The sacrifice of the mass or a continual offering of the Lord Jesus Christ. Heb. i. 3, "*Making* purgation of sins, *sitteth* at the right hand of the majesty on high"—DeSaci. Heb. x. 12, "But this man *offering* one sacrifice for sins forever *sitteth* on the right hand of God"—DeSaci. Vulgate and Douay the same. Matt. xxvi. 28, "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which *shall be shed* for many unto the remission of sins"—DeSaci, Vulgate and Douay. In the first two instances the present participle and present tense of the verb are used. But in the original the perfect participle is used respecting the offering of the sacrifice, to shew that it has been completed forever; and the past tense of the verb respecting his sitting on the right hand of God, as a fruit and consequent of having offered one all-perfect atoning sacrifice. The change of the tense makes the offering a continual sacrificing and purging of sins, *i. e.*, by the priests in the sacrifice of the mass. This also omits three most important points clear in the original, "He purged, by himself, our sins." This leaves no room for priest but himself, no sacrifice but his atonement, no sins but those of the living. Whereas the Popish doctrine is, that Christ is offered in the mass by every priest every day all over the world, for the sins of the living and of the dead.

Ninth—The sacrament of penance. Job—"Wherefore I reprehend myself and *do penance*"—DeSaci. Jer. xviii. 8, "If that nation, against which I have spoken, shall *do penance*"—DeSaci and Douay. Matt. iii. 2, "John preached, saying, *do penance*"; in iv. 17, "Jesus commenced preaching, saying, *do penance*." Luke xiii. 3, 5, "No, I say to you, but unless you shall *do penance*," &c. Acts ii. 38, "But Peter said to them, *do penance*." And without multiplying examples, let it be observed that wherever the words repentance, and to repent occur, they are rendered, in the Romish versions, *penance, and do penance*. But what is penance? It is one of the five spurious sacraments of Popery—consisting in three parts, contrition, confession, and satisfaction. The trembling penitent enters that awful place, the confessional; and, on bended knees before the priest, or confessor, (who, though the greatest villain on earth, is, in the confessional, not mere man, but *vice-God*) under pain of eternal damnation, must disclose every thought, feeling, desire, act of which he or she is conscious, however delicate and humiliating. And do, or suffer, *all and whatever* the priest prescribes as satisfaction for the sins confessed to him, in order to absolution. Every Roman Catholic knows from youth what penance means, and the Romish versions interpose all this between the

sinner and the hope of salvation. The Vulgate employs a term which signifies something to be performed, though not so grossly Romish as the versions. Luther, Beza, Calvin, &c., objected to it.

Tenth—The doctrine of a New Testament sacrificing priesthood.

Acts xi. 31—"Which indeed they did, sending them to the *priests of Jerusalem*."—DeSaci. The Vulgate reads *elders*; the Douay reads *ancients*. Both agree with the Greek original. DeSaci does not translate the word in the Vulgate at all. He introduces a word *never applied in the Vulgate to any rank in the christian Church* "Priests of Jerusalem," is an addition to the text of the Vulgate, by DeSaci.

Acts xv. 6—"Then the apostles *and priests* came together to examine of this matter."—DeSaci. The Vulgate and Douay read *apostles, and elders or ancients*.

1 Tim. iv. 14—"Neglect not the grace that is in you—by the imposition of the hands of the priests."—DeSaci. The Douay reads, *imposition of the hands of the Priesthood*. The Vulgate, *imposition of hands of the Presbytery*, according to the Greek.

1 Tim. v. 19—"Receive not an accusation against a priest."—DeSaci. The Douay the same. The Vulgate reads, *against a presbyter, &c.* It is unnecessary to multiply examples. Suffice it to say, that wherever the Vulgate has senior, presbyter, presbytery, DeSaci has priest, priests, priesthood. The Douay, except in two or three instances, translates the word in the Vulgate. But DeSaci invariably uses a word to which the Vulgate gives no countenance at all. If there were no priesthood countenanced in the Scriptures, what would become of a system of which the priesthood is the very soul?

Eleventh—Subjection of the whole Church to the priesthood.

1 Pet. v. 5—"And ye others who are younger be subject to the priests."—DeSaci. The Vulgate and Douay read, "Ye younger be subject to the elder;" from which it will be seen that DeSaci totally disregards the reading of the Vulgate, where the interests of Popery require it. The use made of this in the confessional is revolting.

Twelfth—Withholding the Scriptures from the ignorant.

Rev. i. 3—"Blessed is he that readeth and heareth the words of this prophecy."—DeSaci, Vulgate, and Douay, all the same. They all make reading and hearing the acts of the same person. The promised blessing is therefore limited to those who can *read*; and the Scriptures are consequently withheld from the ignorant. Not so the inspired Word. *Few can read, all can hear*, and the blessing is as certainly connected with the hearing of such as cannot read, as with the reading of those who can both read and hear.

The Vulgate and the Romish versions fail to set forth the total depravity of man's fallen nature by the omission, addition, and change of words,—improper use of words and tenses, the meaning of many important passages of God's word is entirely perverted. The Spanish and Portuguese versions are still more corrupt. They, for example,

attempt to place "mother," as applied to the Virgin, on a level with God, by writing it with a capital letter; "Mother," to excite veneration, as in Matt. xii. 48, 49; xiii. 55; John ii. 1, 3, 5; xix. 25, &c. They also countenance canonical hours, as, for example, Matt. xx. 6, 9, "The hour of none," and the "hour of vespers."—Mark xv. 25, 33, 34; Acts ii. 15; iii. 1; x. 3, 9, 30, &c. *Apostolical canons*, "commanding them to keep the *canons* of the apostles and presbyters."—Acts xv. 41. The use of the word "canons" would be of little importance, had there not been an Apocryphal forgery under the name of "apostolical canons," to which the Church of Rome appeals for the authority and antiquity of many of her corrupt practices. Also, the dogma of purgatory, Luke xvi. 28, "Lest they also come to *stop* in this place of torment;" and v. 30, "If one went to them from the dead they would *do penance*."

The entire Protestant Bible is advertized as printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society; yet a Mexican a few years ago, led in the providence of God to Britain, the land of light and liberty, was overcome by the power of the truth which he heard with deep interest, and for the first time in his life, and eagerly desired to procure a Bible to bring home to Mexico. A company of emancipated slaves, about the same time put into a British port, on their way from Cuba to Africa. But the Bible Society could not furnish a single copy of the Scriptures, in either case, but these grossly corrupt Romish versions.

Thirteen—Whole passages added to the Word of God.

Take the following specimens:—Prov. x. 4, "He that trusteth in lies feedeth the winds, and the same runneth after birds that fly away"—Vulgate and Douay. Prov. xiii. 13, "Deceitful souls go astray in sin; the just are merciful and shew mercy"—Vulgate. Prov. xiv. 21, "He that believeth in the Lord loveth mercy"—Vulgate, Douay, &c. Prov. xviii. 8—"Fear casteth down the slothful; and the souls of the effeminate shall be hungry"—Vulgate, &c.

All this and much more like it is sent forth by the British and Foreign Bible Society for "Inspired truth," "Word of life," "Holy scriptures," "Word of God." Is there a single individual who has felt the power of divine truth in his own soul, and realizes his responsibility to God, who will say that the modern Vulgate is a faithful Bible; or Romish versions true translations even of the Vulgate; or justify the Bible Society in sending forth the mass of Popish dogmas, practices, and corruptions of the Word of God which these versions contain? Such as—(1) The worship of saints, angels, images, and relics; (2) The merit of faith, prayer, alms, and good works; (3) The dogmas of celibacy, indulgences, and purgatory; (4) The sacraments of matrimony, and penance; (5) The priestly hierarchy; (6) Withholding the Scriptures from the people; (7) Perverting the meaning of the Word of God; (8) Many large additions to the sacred text.

And we challenge any man qualified to deal with the subject, either to disprove, or explain away, a single fact of all we have adduced. Is

there anything to be compared to these corruptions in our incomparable English authorized version? And, what but the grossest presumption, would endeavour to varnish them by comparing them with the slight imperfections of our version? Can they, who call exposing these errors and opposing their circulation under the name of "pure Word of God," a *useless threadbare controversy*, tell what then is worth holding, or suffering for, in christianity itself? Did the martyrs and reformers who suffered and laboured for the testimony of Jesus, and against these very corruptions, spend or lay down their lives in a mere "useless and threadbare controversy?" What would Drs. McGregor and McCulloch say, had they lived in our day? Their writings, however, make them living testimonies upon the subject. "Popery condemned" shews that the difference was no small matter in Dr. McCulloch's view. And Dr. McGregor so carefully examined the first edition of the Scriptures in Gaelic published by the Society, that though he only found *commas misplaced* to affect the sense—and *only in one instance after the Book of Proverbs*; he made a list of them, and sent it to London for correction in the next edition.—Life, ch. 18.

Would he correct *commas*, in the Gaelic, and take no notice of such a mass of *Popish corruptions* circulated by the Society in the German, Italian, French, Spanish, and Portuguese, unless his whole history is a farce? His godly honesty would rejoice in taking the lead to have the evil remedied, or he would wash his own hands of the sin of misrepresenting God and his word to fellow-men anywhere. Then—

2. A question naturally arises, viz., Does the committee really know the character of the versions in question? And, is it credible that a body of men so liberal and devoted, and actuated by love to God and their fellow-men, and realizing their responsibility, could knowingly circulate such versions for "Holy Scriptures?" To this we reply, that they act with abundant light upon the subject. Opposition has been shewn ever since the committee adopted these versions. Their vote upon it was part of the ground upon which, in 1831, the Trinitarian Society was formed. Ever since the christian Church agreed to hold an annual week of prayer, the downfall of Popery was one important subject of wrestling. God has been wonderfully, and variously answering those prayers. Among other things, light has been thrown upon, and a cry raised against, the support given to Popery by Protestants. It is raised by the press. *The Bulwark* in Scotland, and lately *The Rock* in England, are admirable publications, exclusively devoted to this subject. The cry is raised on the platform by Dukes, Lords, Judges, &c. It is raised, besides in the pulpit, by the mass of the people. Look, for example, at the Protestant institutes to train young men for the contest with Rome; and the Protestant associations all over Scotland and England. Look at the upheavings of the nations of Europe under the curse of Popery. Look at the Pope himself, in the last gasps of his civil power. Does not every true Protestant in Britain tremble at the progress of Popery?

Does not Lord Shaftsbury say, "That nothing short of a miracle can save the Reformation in Britain." And is not all this before the committee's own eyes?

Soon after the week of prayer began to be kept, God appears to have been infusing fresh vigor into the opposition to this part of the Society's work. As far back as 1851 two excellent pamphlets appeared, "Supremacy of Truth," by one of the Society's most honoured agents on the continent, and "The Bible in Italy," by the Hon. and Rev. S. Waldgrave. "The Bible and versions of the Bible," by C. E. Stuart, Esq., 1856. "The New Testament and its Translations," by the same. "Romish versions of the Bible, or facts and arguments for the consideration of Bible Societies," by Rev. J. D. Hales. "Versions of the Holy Scriptures for Roman Catholic countries, or an Appeal to the British and Foreign Bible Society, by Dr. Tregelles, (one of the most learned living Biblical critics.) "A Protest against disseminating erroneous versions," by the Plymouth Auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, (a precedent to other auxiliaries Bible Societies.) "DeSaci's French Bible, a falsified version." "The Bible and the version of DeSaci," by Pozzy. "A Protest against the circulation of the Vulgate and its versions," by C. E. Stuart and Rev. J. D. Hales. "The statement of the British and Foreign Bible Society respecting Roman Catholic versions examined," by C. E. Stuart, Esq. These are the titles of some, at least, of the documents by which the subject has been brought fully and fairly before the committee. There is no want of light. There is no excuse for honest men persisting in the course the committee is pursuing. There is something very inexplicable in the matter.

3. This brings us to consider the attitude of the committee upon this subject. Instead of thoroughly investigating the real state of the case, and acting, as every view we can take of the subject would suggest, they have given unsatisfactory replies to appeals and protests. A member of committee, as such, has published a pamphlet, of which we have given a specimen. They justify the course chiefly on three grounds, as may be seen in a letter from the London Secretary, in reply to enquires by the President of the Pictou Auxiliary, and appended to the Pictou report of February, 1867. These grounds or pleas are: the insignificance of the errors, the necessity for the circulation of the Romish versions, and the great benefits following their perusal. Now, let us examine these pleas.

First—The insignificance of the errors of the Romish versions.

The Secretary says: "Defects and inaccuracies there are no doubt in translations from the Vulgate, (is any translation perfect and faultless?) but the few errors are more than corrected by the great body of the text."

From the examples we have given, we leave the reader to judge for himself if the "errors are few," and the mere "defects and inaccuracies" of a translation all but *faultless*. And further, the

question is not, how far truth may triumph over the error, or the error frustrate the truth; but, is any man, or body of men, having the truth at liberty, under any consideration to give error instead of that truth? Will the law permit to give poison for medicine, or counterfeit for coin?

Second—The necessity for such circulation.

"When a bigotted papist," says the Secretary, "is desirous of obtaining a Bible rendered from the Vulgate, because it is recognized by his own Church, and *will take no other*, we deem it a christian duty to allow him to purchase such a copy," &c. This statement appears plausible till examined. The fact is, they publish and sell the Romish version, and *are not at liberty, by the civil law, to point out any difference between the faithful and corrupt version.* M. DePresensce prohibited the colporteurs from interfering in any matter of controversy, under pain of "immediate dismissal."—Report, 1859, p. 27. It has been already shewn that no Roman Catholic, however *bigotted*, dares possess, or read, *even the Romish version, without the written license of his Superior.* But is such a papist met with? One of the Society's most honoured agents, writing from Italy, says: "During a residence of many years in this country, during which I have put into circulation a very large number of copies of the Scriptures, *I can assure you there never has existed a desire for the Popish translation.*"—Supremacy of Truth, p. 16. Another says, "It is a complete mistake to *imagine* that people prefer the Roman Catholic version. All they ask for is a *faithful translation* of the Scriptures. If they ever preferred the Romish version, the time has gone by."—Bible in Italy, p. 14. Another Agent, in a letter in the *London Record*, Aug. 1856, says: "As far as my experience is concerned *for the last thirteen years*, I have found the Protestant or faithful version always preferred by a Roman Catholic, when the question of choice was put to him." Another, a Colporteur, states, "That the first question put to him by an intelligent anxious Spaniard in Gibraltar, was, 'Can the contents of that book be depended upon.' And from the Society's very last Report, 1867, it will be seen that the demand and sale in France, are of the Protestant versions, whereas in Belgium, such as regard the authority of the Church, refuse *any* Bible.

Here, then, we have the plea repudiated by those most competent to know its value. Intelligent, devoted ministers, agents and colporteurs, in the field, engaged in the work, actuated by the purest of motives, and without a single instance in the Society's own reports in support of it. No man can regard a plea in such circumstances, should the most honorable body of men in the world persist in putting it forth. But even if the plea had been as strong as it is put: "That a bigotted papist will buy this and no other;" is the Committee acting in accordance with their own fundamental law, and keeping faith with the Christian public who contribute the funds at their disposal, on the understood principle of that law as already shown.

But rising still higher, and bringing the matter to the bar of the Word of God, are we not in danger that the Lord shall say, "Who hath required this at your hands?" Does one single text, He has inspired, warrant any man or body of men to change, or soften, any part of his truth, and far less give for his word what He has never spoken? Would Moses, or Elijah, or Jeremiah, or Paul, or the Reformers dare to tamper with God's message? Do missionaries so falsify God's Word on any part of the field? Yet all of them were and are encompassed with greater dangers and temptations than the Society's agents. Will men assume to be wiser and kindlier to win souls than God himself? Do men think to make God's Word more palatable and successful than He himself makes it? Is any saved by being beguiled into the truth? Is it with carnal weapons the battle's of the Lord are fought? Is it not in his own providence that *He opens* the way for his own word in the world, and by his own spirit that *He opens* the hearts of sinners to receive it for their eternal good? Why not then lean upon his own arm and labour in his own strength? This was the secret of Paul's power and success. This enabled Luther alone to confront the whole force of the Papacy. It is truth that gains the victory over error. Does not God say to Societies, as well as to individuals, "Take heed to thyself and to thy doctrine, so shalt thou save thyself and them that hear thee."

Third—The third and last plea we notice is the great benefits resulting from the perusal of these versions.

"The Vulgate made Luther what he was, and had a weighty influence in bringing the Reformation about; and hundreds of our Colporteurs in France have been led to abandon the errors of popery by reading DeSaci."

This is very special pleading; and is as unsound in principle, as it is untrue in history. It is unsound in principle. This is just the anti-Scriptural principle, that "the end justifies the means." "Shall we do evil that good may come?" What ideas they have of the blessed God, who imagine that he can tolerate anti-christian errors, because they are wrapped up with his sacred truth?

It is incorrect in history, also. If we are to believe the historians of the Reformation, it is not true, that "the Vulgate made Luther what he was, or had weighty influence in bringing about the Reformation." The Spirit of the Lord was impressing Luther's mind before he came in contact with the Vulgate at all, and when he found and perused it, he not only discovered so much of the corruptions of Popery as alienated him from it as his religion, but so much of the errors of the Vulgate, as made him dissatisfied with it as his Bible. Luther and the Reformers had no choice. The Vulgate was the only one within their reach. But with the most untiring perseverance, they mastered the languages and translated the originals, even at the risk of their very lives. It was Luther's Bible translated from the originals into German, Erasmus's Greek New Testament, and Tyndall's English

translation of it, that had such influence in bringing the Reformation about. It is a striking fact that the Reformers, though they multiplied copies of the Scriptures, never made a single translation from the Vulgate. Luther, Beza, Calvin, Martyr, Polanus, Molerus, &c., pointed out its errors, as fully as they have been pointed out to this day. These were not the men to strain at gnats and swallow camels in the things of God and eternity. They left no man in doubt as to what they regarded as the word of God, and the value they set upon it. No man since his day would more unsparingly denounce the policy in support of which his name is appealed to, than Luther. And those who parade the above statement, would consult their own reputation, by being more cautious till better informed. Besides, the cases are not parallel; while the Reformers had no faithful version, they refused to accept a corrupt one. While the Bible Society have a faithful version before them in every language referred to, they refuse to abide by it. But it is said, "*hundreds of the French Colporteurs have abandoned popery by reading DeSaci.*" Is it meant that the errors influenced them? But if it was the truth in DeSaci, it had to contend with both the prejudice in the mind, and the errors in the book; so that a Bible without errors would have double advantage. But do these colporteurs remain satisfied with DeSaci, more than Luther and the Reformers? And, even should they still use DeSaci, on the ground of his more polite French, their minds are enlightened to distinguish truth from error. The Roman Catholic of any country is in a very different state. The errors are just his religion; and the Bible that should contain nothing but what is divine, and therefore at once discover to him the error of his religion, comes to him containing the elements of his erroneous religion: and as Dr. Stewart, of Leghorn, states, prove a "stumbling block to honest enquirers." But the quotations already given, from pamphlets published on the Continent, fully meet this plea. And, possibly the Colporteurs were more or less in the plight of the Mexican, or the emancipated slaves, that the corrupt was the only version within their reach at the time. It is also said, "DeSaci was a good man,"—"a Jansenist—condemned by the Pope, and suffered much for the truth." The point at issue is not, was DeSaci a good man? But, is his version a faithful translation of the word of God? All that can be said of DeSaci himself, says nothing of his Bible. It is also said the Bible Society is a great and good society, much owned of God in their labour. This is just what is said of DeSaci, but this does not make error in their translations a whit less an error. It rather makes error more inexcusable and more injurious. And God blesses his own truth, circulated by their instrumentality, without implicating his glorious character in any of their errors, just as he does with individuals and churches. Abraham was a good man; Peter was a good man. The church of Pergamos had much that was commended. But that did not justify or alleviate the wrong of Abraham denying his wife, Peter denying his master, or the church of Pergamos tolerating Nicolaitanism.

And what is the principle of covering the badness by the goodness, after all, but the very Romish error of *merit of good works*. The very greatness and goodness of the B. & F. B. S. makes error in their doings all the more dangerous. It goes forth with their imprimatur: and it becomes our duty all the more, therefore, to endeavour its removal. That errors should occur is no way surprising. But that a great and benevolent society should so long persist in a course, so clearly at variance with the whole tenor of God's word—Deut. xii. 32; Prov. xxx. 6; Jer. xxiii. 28; Ezek. ii. 4; Rev. xxii. 18, 19;—so contrary to the deepest convictions of duty, of so many of the most earnest and devoted christians; and in disregard of such light, testimonies, appeals, protests, and withdrawals, is incomprehensible. Nay, human *idolatry commended*, to the disparagement of God's eternal truth in the very name of the committee, sounds a note of warning to every sound Protestant. A deputation from the committee, addressing a public meeting of an auxiliary branch in the West of England, stated that "they cannot tamper with these versions." That is, they cannot correct them. If they send them at all, they must send them as they are. Alas, has it come to this! DeSaci's, Martin's, Scio's translations must go forth as they left them, with acknowledged corruptions. But the Word of God will not be sent forth as He gave it! There is something wrong, radically wrong, here.

4. And though we have nothing to guide us to a definite conclusion, bearing upon this point, let us look for a moment, at the constituent elements of the committee. Some who ought to be better informed appear to be under great misapprehension upon this point. They appear to think that the committee is made up of very nearly equal numbers of Episcopalians and Dissenters. It is a very great mistake. To Episcopalians, as such, we have no objections in the world. But to Puseyites we have the strongest objections. Episcopacy, in England especially, is largely Puseyite; and this is the danger of England's Protestantism this day; the canker of her noblest institutions.

Of thirty-six laymen members of the London Committee, six are to be foreigners, and may be of any, or no persuasion at all, so far as the regulations of the Society are concerned. Of the remaining thirty, there are fifteen Episcopalians and fifteen Dissenters.

Besides these, the President, Vice Presidents, Secretaries, and Treasurer, in all fifty more, are members *ex officio*. All these, with perhaps two, or at most three, of the Vice Presidents, are Episcopalians. Here, then, we have at least sixty-three; and the great majority of them in the most influential positions in society; Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Clergy, 34; Dukes, Earls, Lords, Baronets, 13—in all 47. The rank of the remaining sixteen of the sixty-three is not stated. But it is a notorious fact that the majority of the bishops, and nearly three-fourths of the clergy, and very largely the people, especially the upper ranks, are Puseyites and Ritualists; many of them going openly over to popery. In these circumstances, it is beyond all doubt that popery is a constituent element of the very committee itself.

Let us now look at the other side. There are first fifteen Dissenters laymen. Then one hundred and fifty-five clergymen, whose annual subscription entitles them to membership in the Society : all of these who are Dissenters, are members of committee. But there is no mark in the list to distinguish Dissenter from Churchman. Taking, however, the Dissenting clergy at 3,000, which is above the real figure ; and the Episcopal at 22,000, which is really below the figure, we have 1 Dissenter to 7 Episcopalians ; or 22 Dissenters out of 155 clergy members of the Society. Here, then, we have 15 and 22, 37 to 63.

But let us still view the twenty-two Dissenting ministers in another aspect. Between the Presbyterian Synod of England, and the U. P. and Established Churches of Scotland, there are upwards of one hundred and fifty Presbyterian ministers in England. Nineteen of these at least are in London ; and not a few of them second to none of the clerical order in the kingdom, for sound judgment, warm zeal in the cause of Christ, and prompt liberality to every object of benevolence ; yet, only one Presbyterian minister in all England is known to contribute to the B. & F. B. S. Where were Drs. Hamilton, McCrie, Archer, King, Lorimer and Patrick Miller, &c. But further, Dissent in England embraces all who do not belong to the Established Church, viz., Presbyterians, Independents, Wesleyans, Baptists, Quakers, Unitarians, &c. These are the elements from which the Dissenters' side of the committee, both lay and clerical, is made up, and of the thirty-seven we know of only one Presbyterian having right to sit and vote there. That there were Unitarians is beyond question. In deference to their presence the meetings of committee were neither opened nor closed with prayer ; ignoring christianity itself, which must have been then, at least, at a low ebb in the committee. A change was effected so far as to restore prayer. But the membership remains unaltered. What guarantee, then, have we of soundness in this side ? And should there be both soundness and harmony, they must be always in the minority. Nor is this all. The *Edinburgh Witness* stated, upon good authority, in 1847, that the Jesuits had their members officiating as clergymen in the pulpits of every section of the Protestant church in the United Kingdom, except the Free Church ; but that one was passing through their hall." Every effort was put forth to detect him, but he eluded discovery, if there. One branch, however, affords unmistakeable evidence in corroboration of this statement. Do they fail to endeavour everything by which they can influence the community ? And they are bent on three things, to gain the treasures, ascend to the ruling power, and spread their religion. Do they not enter into families as nurses, servants, &c., into jails, hospitals, workhouses, army and navy as chaplains and officials, into printing offices, as compositors, editors, &c., into publishing establishments, where they can, and do, change the character of the publications, especially school-books, history, and biography. Have they not, as clerks in important public offices, gained access to, and *corrupted some, and secreted other important State documents* ? Does the hierarchy, from the Pope downward,

set itself most violently against the operations of Bible Societies, as such? Do they look upon the triumph of Popery as certain and near; and both oppose *ab extra*, and corrupt and weaken *ab nitra*, every other organization and institution, down to the family circle; and give a Romish taint to State papers, periodicals, biographies, history, school-books, but never attempted to corrupt this great Protestant fountain of pure truth, the Bible Society? Is it credible? Puseyites are on the committee as such, what hinders Jesuits, in the character of Protestants, being there? If Socinianism and Puseyism and Jesuitism were not leavening the committee, and shaping its operations, would the plea of the "bigotted papist" have such importance?—a plea utterly denied from the Continent. Would some of the vilest idolatry of Antichrist acknowledged to be the work of DeSaci (Heb. xi. 21), be commended above the inspired truth of God, in the very name of the committee? Would history be actually misrepresented, in regard to Luther and the Reformation? While besides what is expended in London in printing in foreign languages, £9,214 stg. was expended in Lisbon, South America and Mexico for printing and circulation of the Scriptures in Spanish and Portuguese, would the committee be unable to furnish a few years ago a single copy of the Protestant Bible in these languages, though it was advertised for sale, and at a given price, in the Report? Would the Popish system be substantially incorporated with the inspired Word, so far mutilated in the Romish version, and be sent forth as "the Holy Scriptures"? We hold that this is the only satisfactory solution of the mystery about the committee's conduct in this matter. We are apt to form our estimate of the whole committee from the known character of Lord Shaftsbury, and a few others. The noble Lord is perhaps not present at a single meeting for the transaction of the committee's business throughout the year. And even should he know and feel dissatisfied, he might have no course left him but to resign, which might be a very difficult step in his case.

In coming to a conclusion, we have to say that it has been from no ill design or prejudice to person or party we have separated from the British and Foreign Bible Society, or written a single word to this hour; but from strong conviction of duty, however narrow-mindedness has been judging of us. It has been forced upon us by circumstances, and we are satisfied that the subject only requires calm and impartial investigation to convince the most unsuspecting that the committee are doing what no unprejudiced mind can justify, and what concerns every contributor. It is done in his name and by his concurrence and assistance. He is involved in it. The more we have examined, the more do we feel that we were shut up to the steps we took, and do now discharge a duty to the public in bringing to light, in the working of the committee, what we think no man in this province could bring himself to believe if it were not beyond doubt. The Secretary of the Nova Scotia Auxiliary published that if the facts were as we stated, we had done a duty of which all should approve. The editor of the

Witness, in declining to publish a communication, said, that we had fully established the charge which we preferred, viz., the circulation of the Romish versions. It will be seen how far honest convictions will be acted upon. We know that our voice and efforts are feeble to influence. But facts ought to have weight with such as believe that "Every one shall give account of himself to God," and "Receive the things done in his body." We owe it to ourselves, not to partake in what we are satisfied is wrong, nor suffer ourselves to be misrepresented. We owe it to others, to bring before them in its proper aspects and bearings, a subject in which all christians are concerned, and in regard to which few ever suspected anything to be unsatisfactory.

Fellow christians, who fear God, love his word, and feel compassion for the souls of the perishing, who owe all you are through grace, and all you hope to be to the mercy of God in Christ, and through his own word only; and, therefore, know somewhat of your privilege and responsibility,—we ask you, can you concur by your silence, and encourage, and make, by your support, the circulation of the versions, of which we have given you specimens, your own act? Brethren in the ministry, all we have written here is within *your* reach as *well as ours*, and more also. Can you with a clear conscience, standing in the pulpit and speaking in the name of God, say to your people, "*These are faithful versions of the Holy Scriptures?*" Nay, can you withhold your protest against such circulation? Do not these versions belie God, attempt to nullify his truth, and give occasion of stumbling to fellow mortals? Can one convincing reason be given, attested by a single substantiating fact in favour of it? Hath not God said, "Thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord." "Thou shalt speak my words unto them, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear." "Therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me." Ezek. ii. 4, 7; iii. 17. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound who shall prepare himself to the battle?" 1 Cor. xiv. 8. Are these distinctions between truth and error abolished? Are these solemn warnings cancelled? Do they leave room for a single plea of all that are offered in behalf of the course complained of? God's message must be delivered as he has given it, and translated into any language, so as to be the message of God without the contradicting falsehoods of men, at the peril of our souls.

Now, if all were to unite, in an earnest and firm remonstrance, with the committee to abandon connexion with the corrupt versions, and return to the plain meaning of their fundamental law, and insist upon it as the condition of future support, it would exonerate themselves and strengthen the hands of those in England and on the continent who strive for the same object—whatever effect it would have upon the committee. Ought not christians to wash their hands of what no man ventures really to justify? If the way were only open for all minor Societies to unite with the great central one, an impulse would be given to operations for the spread of the Word of life throughout the world, never to be otherwise expected. And we need not doubt

but things will move in that direction, as evangelical life will be diffused, and the glory of the latter days will be approaching. Truth and error are coming every day into more earnest and unyielding conflict. The final struggle is not far distant, nor the issue doubtful! The day is not far distant when a corrupt version of the Word inspired by God, shall not be circulated, printed, or commended in any part of the world!

Reader, we now leave this subject before you, that under a sense of responsibility you may decide as to your own duty. If you find it your duty after all to contribute to the circulation of the versions in question, we have only to say that our duty is discharged. But if you feel in conscience that it involves you in a course of which you cannot approve, then there are other Societies based upon a principle excluding from their operations corrupt versions of all descriptions; and through them, as channels, your liberality, which you owe to God and man, may find abundant vent.

The Scottish National Bible Society has its agencies in Germany, Italy, France, and other parts of Europe—in India, China, and Colonies of the British Empire. And it is right to state that they never met with a single instance of a "*bigotted papist who is willing to take the version from the Vulgate sanctioned by his church, and will receive no other.*" Another important point is that of financial economy. The last report of the B. & F. B. S. shews an expenditure of £212,318 sterling in the proper work of Bible circulation, and with this a circulation of 2,383,380 copies, or 1s. 9½d. each. The last report of the Scottish National shews an income of £13,333, with a circulation of 243,134 copies, being 1s. 2½d. each. Or in other words, if the funds of the B. & F. B. S. were managed with the same economy with those of the Scottish, their circulation should be 3,731,800, or nearly a million and a quarter more than were actually circulated. Let the man who can explain this satisfactorily. We confess our inability to understand it; as both labour chiefly in the same field.

APPENDIX.

In the forty-second Report of the Pictou Auxiliary Bible Society, pp. 9, it is said, "In one or two instances objections have been raised to the prejudice of this Society, against a part of the Society's foreign work; but in each instance where Mr. Russel *obtained a hearing* the objections were answered, and a *resolution proposed and passed* to continue, as heretofore, their support to the Society."

Now a slander is insinuated here against some place not named. Will the committee name the place where Mr. Russel *did not obtain a hearing*? And further, Scotsburn seems to be the place particularly meant. The Branch there, nearly a year previously, resolved, without a dissenting voice, to connect with the Scottish National Bible Society. Mr. Russel did what he could to induce them to reverse their former resolution, and had patient hearing to the last word, but no resolution *passed*, or even proposed to the meeting. The Report goes on to say, "In connexion with this subject your committee deem it expedient to subjoin in the appendix, printed with the report, a letter written by the Secretary of the Home Society, addressed to this Auxiliary, bearing reference to the matter in question, and being an answer to an application made by your committee for information on the subject. Such an answer and *emphatic denial* of the charges made should be sufficient, and will, doubtless, be more satisfactory, as an answer, coming from the quarter it does, than any declaration or statement by an Auxiliary could be. Your attention is, therefore, directed to the Secretary's letter."

Now, in regard to this let it be remembered,—*First*, That no report is read in public until it has been read, considered, approved and passed in committee, at a meeting of which all members are notified, and every member present has the right fully to express his mind. Every member is, therefore, understood to know all that is done and concur therein. On the committee are names of 6 ministers, 7 magistrates, and 14 others, in all 27, which ought to ensure impartiality. On the public platform, however, *not one word of the above quotation was read, nor the slightest allusion to the letter so recommended to public attention as an emphatic denial of the charges against the Society*. Both were passed over in dead silence, as though neither had ever been written. Why not read what is so recommended if all is fair?

Secondly,—The charges referred to are, connexion with the circulation of the Apocrypha, and "circulation of the Romish versions." The first of these formed no part of the ground of our joint public exception—no part of the objections referred to in the previous quotation. It was never spoken of at Scotsburn, Earltown, or River John, the places there indicated. It was first matter of inquiry by private correspondence, the treatment of which reflects no credit upon the parties concerned. It was then asserted on what appeared to be good evidence from the annual report, but afterwards withdrawn. The Secretary's letter denies the truth of this.

As to the other, the only charge we prefer, the Secretary owns the truth of it as clearly as language can well do so. He had no alternative. These versions are advertized as printed, and on sale by the Society in every annual report, where the Pictou committee could see it. But in the face of all this they say that the Secretary's letter is "An emphatic denial of the charges—ought to be sufficient—and is more satisfactory than any declaration from the Auxiliary!" This is a gross perversion. It would be incredible, if it were not published under their own superintendence. Is the Pictou committee prepared to declare that the British and Foreign Bible Society *do not circulate the Romish versions?* That the Secretary says *that they do not?* That we have stated an untruth when we stated *that they do?* What else can "an emphatic denial" mean? What else do they wish to impress upon the public? And if the Secretary's letter had been suppressed what would the public infer from the report but that we were guilty of vile slander? It is painful in the extreme to expose this piece of work. But we have no alternative. The command which prohibits our injuring the good name of another, also prohibits our allowing others to injure our own. If from prejudice they have ventured so far, they must accept the consequences.

The London Secretary's letter, so far as it refers to the Romish versions, is subjoined, and the reader can judge of its admissions or denials for himself:

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

London, 10 Earl Street, Blackfriars, E. C., Nov. 30th, 1866.

THE REV. DR. BAYNE,—

My Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 6th addressed to Mr. Knolleke has been duly received

I very much regret to hear that the action of your Auxiliary is somewhat embarrassed by persistent attacks on the Parent Society, and perhaps a few lines may show that we are not so amenable to censure as some would insinuate. The charges made against the Society were met by Dr. Gill when he was in Nova Scotia, and more recently in an admirable address by your own travelling agent, Mr. Russell.

As to the circulation of what are called Roman Catholic versions of the Scripture, I may remark that the Society does make a limited use of translations from the Latin Vulgate. Our decided preference is for translations direct from the originals, and our Agents are instructed to adopt every means attainable for promoting the circulation of such, but when a bigotted Papist is desirous of obtaining a Bible rendered from the Vulgate because it is recognized by his own church, and *will take no other*, we deem it a christian duty to allow him to *purchase* such a copy, rather than that he should be left without any Bible at all, especially as it is proved that the perusal of versions from the Vulgate has in innumerable instances drawn men from all the errors of popery, and led to a conscientious and consistent profession of Protestantism. Hundreds of our French Colporteurs have been led to discover and abandon the errors of popery by reading the translation of DeSaci, a pretty convincing proof that it has no tendency to keep men Papists.

We print these versions from the text of the translator without alteration, so that it can be scarcely affirmed with truth that the Society inserts Popish errors, seeing that it had nothing to do with the translations in question. I am happy to say that the circulation of them is diminishing yearly, and no one will rejoice more than the Committee when the time arrives for dispensing with them altogether. But you will see that we treat the matter as a practical question, and not as assuming the functions of a Board of Biblical critics. Defects and inaccuracies there are no doubt in the translations from the Vulgate (is any translation perfect and faultless?) but the few errors are more than corrected by the great body of the text. We think it better that a man should have such a Bible than none, and on this principle we act. The Vulgate made Luther what he was, and had weighty influence in bringing about the Protestant Reformation.

We are charged, I see, with fraternising with Societies which circulate the Apocrypha, and making them grants of Scripture. That a letter of courtesy may occasionally be interchanged I do not deny,—but I do deny that grants of Scriptures are made to such societies.

Allusion is made to the action of the Prussian authorities in not conceding to agents of the National Bible Society of Scotland the same licenses as are accorded to the Colporteurs of this Society. With this we have nothing to do. The Prussian Government treat us with much consideration, and, as being well known to them, may not unnaturally give us privileges which they would hesitate to grant to new and unknown societies. It is competent to the German government to act as it thinks best in the matter, but with their decisions we have nothing to do. It is however inferred from the fact, that this Society circulates Bibles with the Apocrypha, and therefore the Prussian authorities favour us. This is wholly untrue; and I think the charge should not have been made by any christian gentleman. At least I hope the friends of this Society in Nova Scotia will give the Committee credit for uttering and publishing truth.

Believe me, yours very truly,

S. B. BERGEY.

Mr. B's. letter is the reply to a letter of 17th October, 1866, addressed to the Vice President of the Wallace Branch, in which it was proved that the British and Foreign Bible Society published versions of the Scriptures containing Romish errors.

1. By their own Minute of 16th March, 1863, Mr. B. confirms this.
2. Their own law, "Regulation IV."—"That all grants of the Scriptures to Societies which circulate the Apocrypha, be made under the express condition that they be sold or distributed without alteration or addition; and that the proceeds of the sales of any such copies of the Scriptures be held at the disposal of the British and Foreign Bible Society." See also their Report 1859, p. 39.
3. The extract from the Report, 1865, of the National Bible Society of Scotland, in which reference is made to the circulation of the Apocrypha, was shown, in the *Presbyterian Witness*, 14th Sept. last, to apply not to the British and Foreign, but to some kindred Society which circulated the Apocrypha. With such the British and Foreign, according to their own law, can fraternize. If not, why have such a law, and publish it annually for the last forty years?

he
ay
ip-

to
ded
rus-
n to
it to
et as
It is
ocry-
; and
At
mittee

GNE.

essed to
that the
res con-

8.
riptures
ress con-
ion; and
be held at
eir Report

le Society
Apocrypha,
not to the
culated the
eir own law,
ually for the